

Application No. 10/044,711**Atty Docket No. INXT 1018-1****In the Claims:**

The following is a list of claims pending in this application and their current status. This listing replaces all prior versions and listings. For printing purposes, we have increased the font size of sub and superscripts in the equations that appear in a few claims, without changing any of the texts.

1. (Previously presented) A computer assisted method of auditing a superset of training data, the superset comprising examples of documents having one or more preexisting category assignments, the method including:
 - partitioning the superset into at least two disjoint sets, including a test set and a training set, wherein the test set includes one or more test documents and the training set includes examples of documents belonging to at least two categories;
 - automatically categorizing the test documents using the training set;
 - calculating a metric of confidence based on results of the categorizing step and comparing the automatic category assignments for the test documents to the preexisting category assignments; and
 - reporting the test documents and preexisting category assignments that are suspicious and the automatic category assignments that appear to be missing from the test documents, based on the metric of confidence.
2. (Original) The method of claim 1, further including repeating the partitioning, categorizing and calculating steps until at least one-half of the documents in the superset have been assigned to the test set.
3. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the test set created in the partition step has a single test document.
4. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the test set created in the partition step has a plurality of test documents.

Application No. 10/044,711

Atty Docket No. INXT 1018-1

5. (Currently amended) The method of claim 1, further including repeating the partitioning, categorizing and calculating steps until ~~substantially all~~ more than 50 percent of the documents in the superset have been assigned to the test set.

6. (Currently amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the partitioning, categorizing and calculating steps are carried out automatically ~~substantially without user intervention~~.

7. (Currently amended) The method of claim 5, wherein the partitioning, categorizing and calculating steps are carried out automatically ~~substantially without user intervention~~.

8. (Currently amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the partitioning, categorizing, calculating and reporting steps are carried out automatically ~~substantially without user intervention~~.

9. (Currently amended) The method of claim 5, wherein the partitioning, categorizing, calculating and reporting steps are carried out automatically ~~substantially without user intervention~~.

10. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the categorizing step includes determining k nearest neighbors of the test documents and the calculating step is based on a k nearest neighbors categorization logic.

11. (Previously presented) The method of claim 10, wherein the metric of confidence is an unweighted measure of distance between a particular test document and the examples of documents belonging to various categories.

12. (Previously presented) The method of claim 11, where the unweighted measure includes application of a relationship $\Omega_0(\mathbf{d}_t, T_m) = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{K(\mathbf{d}_t) \cap T_m\}} s(\mathbf{d}_t, \mathbf{d})$,

wherein

Ω_0 is a function of the particular test document represented by the a feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and of various categories T_m ; and

s is a metric of distance between the particular test document feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and certain sample documents represented by feature vectors \mathbf{d} , the certain

Application No. 10/044,711

Atty Docket No. INXT 1018-1

sample documents being among a set of k nearest neighbors of the particular test document having category assignments to the various categories T_m .

13. (Previously presented) The method of claim 10, wherein the metric of confidence is a weighted measure of distance between a particular test document and the examples of documents belonging to various categories, the weighted measure taking into account the density of a neighborhood of the test document.

14. (Previously presented) The method of claim 13, wherein the weighted measure includes application of a relationship

$$\Omega_1(\mathbf{d}_t, T_m) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{d}_1 \in \{K(\mathbf{d}_t) \cap T_m\}} s(\mathbf{d}_t, \mathbf{d}_1)}{\sum_{\mathbf{d}_2 \in K(\mathbf{d}_t)} s(\mathbf{d}_t, \mathbf{d}_2)}, \text{ wherein}$$

Ω_1 is a function of the test document represented by the a feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and of various categories T_m ; and

s is a metric of distance between the test document feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and certain sample documents represented by feature vectors \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 , the certain sample documents \mathbf{d}_1 being among a set of k nearest neighbors of the test document having category assignments to the various categories T_m and the certain sample documents \mathbf{d}_2 being among a set of k nearest neighbors of the test document.

15. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the reporting step further includes filtering the reported test documents based on the metric of confidence.

16. (Previously presented) The method of claim 15, wherein filtering further includes color coding the reported test documents based on the metric of confidence.

17. (Previously presented) The method of claim 15, wherein filtering further includes selecting for display the reported test documents based on the metric of confidence.

18. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein reporting includes generating a printed report.

Application No. 10/044,711**Atty Docket No. INXT 1018-1**

19. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein reporting includes generating a file conforming to XML syntax.

20. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein reporting includes generating a sorted display identifying at least a portion of the test documents.

21. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further including calculating a precision score for the reported test documents.

22. (Previously presented) A computer assisted method of auditing a superset of training data, the superset comprising examples of documents having one or more preexisting category assignments, the method including:

determining k nearest neighbors of the documents in a test subset automatically partitioned from the superset;

automatically categorizing the documents based on the k nearest neighbors into a plurality of categories;

calculating a metric of confidence based on results of the categorizing step and comparing the automatic category assignments for the documents to the preexisting category assignments; and

reporting the documents in the test subset and preexisting category assignments that are suspicious and the automatic category assignments that appear to be missing from the documents in the test subset, based on the metric of confidence.

23. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein the metric of confidence is an unweighted measure of distance between a particular test document and the examples of documents belonging to various categories.

24. (Original) The method of claim 23, where the unweighted measure includes application of a relationship $\Omega_0(\mathbf{d}_t, T_m) = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{K(\mathbf{d}_t) \cap T_m\}} s(\mathbf{d}_t, \mathbf{d})$, wherein

Ω_0 is a function of the test document represented by the a feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and of various categories T_m ; and

Application No. 10/044,711

Atty Docket No. INXT 1018-1

s is a metric of distance between the test document feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and certain sample documents represented by feature vectors \mathbf{d} , the certain sample documents being among a set of k nearest neighbors of the test document having category assignments to the various categories T_m .

25. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein the metric of confidence is a weighted measure of distance between a particular test document and the examples of documents belonging to various categories, the weighted measure taking into account the density of a neighborhood of the test document.

26. (Original) The method of claim 25, wherein the weighted measure

includes application of a relationship $\Omega_1(\mathbf{d}_t, T_m) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{d}_1 \in \{K(\mathbf{d}_t) \cap T_m\}} s(\mathbf{d}_t, \mathbf{d}_1)}{\sum_{\mathbf{d}_2 \in K(\mathbf{d}_t)} s(\mathbf{d}_t, \mathbf{d}_2)}$, wherein

Ω_1 is a function of the test document represented by the a feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and of various categories T_m ; and

s is a metric of distance between the test document feature vector \mathbf{d}_t and certain sample documents represented by feature vectors \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 , the certain sample documents \mathbf{d}_1 being among a set of k nearest neighbors of the test document having category assignments to the various categories T_m and the certain sample documents \mathbf{d}_2 being among a set of k nearest neighbors of the test document.

27. (Currently amended) The method of claim 22, wherein the determining, categorizing and calculating steps are carried out automatically ~~substantially without user intervention~~.

28. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein the reporting step further includes filtering the documents based on the metric of confidence.

29. (Previously presented) The method of claim 28, wherein the filtering step further includes color coding the reported documents based on the metric of confidence.

Application No. 10/044,711

Atty Docket No. INXT 1018-1

30. (Previously presented) The method of claim 28, wherein the filtering step further includes selecting for display the reported documents based on the metric of confidence.

31. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein reporting includes generating a printed report.

32. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein reporting includes generating a file conforming to XML syntax.

33. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein reporting includes generating a sorted display identifying at least a portion of the documents.

34. (Previously presented) The method of claim 22, further including calculating a precision score for the reported documents.